

BRITISH EMBARGO ON COPPER RIGHT AT NEW YORK PORT

Diverts All America's Supply,
Even When Shipped Elsewhere, to Home Use.

PAYS TOP PRICE, BUT!

Action on the Part of the U.S.
Government Expected
Soon.

While denials are made in official circles in Washington that this Government will send a note to England protesting against seizure of American shipments to neutral countries, developments of the last few days are forcing a crisis and making imperative action on the part of the United States quite probable.

England has assumed absolute control of the sea, not only closing it against Germany and Austria, but exercising supervision over all shipments by American exporters to neutral countries of articles upon her list of contraband. This domination is exercised not merely at the line of actual blockade, but begins at the Port of New York.

The copper industry furnishes the most striking example of to-day's conditions in foreign trade. Shipments of copper to neutral countries has been stopped by England excepting in case of certain favored consignments. Although Sweden is a neutral country and has strictly forbidden exports of contraband to Germany, the British Government informally has notified American copper exporters that no further shipments can be made from this country to Sweden.

The five largest exporting copper companies have been compelled by England to sign an agreement that they will notify in advance the British Consul General in New York of all intended shipments to foreign countries and the a copy of their contracts. The Consul General immediately notifies his home Government by cable of the facts, so that veto power can be exercised. Despite these conditions two cargoes have been seized recently by the British Government and the ships "diverted for inspection," as the official phraseology terms it.

England has ordered Canada to put an embargo upon exports of copper from that country to other than the home country. This has checked shipments from the Dominion to the United States.

In order to prevent a test case in any of the seized cargoes, the British Government is making private settlements with American shippers, purchasing the copper for its own use at top prices. None of the copper cases has been allowed to go into the prize courts for adjudication, obviating the necessity of the British proving that the neutral consignment was false and that the copper was in reality imported for Germany.

The latter has just been taken and the court, in giving a civil action started in New York City by a Swiss manufacturing concern against the American Metal Company for violation of contract.

A consignment of copper to the Swiss Company was detained by the British at Gibraltar. After long delay, the American company finally accepted the British offer to purchase the cargo at a price slightly higher than in a British collier to England.

An American company in its reply practically admits the statements of facts, but asserts that it was forced into the action by force majeure, meaning the superior power of the British navy.

\$3.00
Round Trip
Washington
SUNDAY EXCURSION
Pennsylvania R.R.
Sunday, May 26, June 13
Special Train leaves New York, Penn.
Arrives Washington, D.C., 12:30 P.M.; returning,
leaves Washington, D.C., 4:30 P.M.
Ticket on sale preceding each excursion.
Took on sale preceding each excursion.
TICKETS ON SALE AT NEW YORK, PENN.
ARRIVED WASHINGTON, D.C., 12:30 P.M.; RETURNING,
LEAVES WASHINGTON, D.C., 4:30 P.M.
TICKETS ON SALE PRECEDING EACH EXCURSION.
TICKETS ON SALE PRECEDING EACH EXCURSION.

All best or foisted articles ad-
vertised in The World will be
brought at The World's Information
Bureau, Pulitzer Building
Avenue, Park Row, World's
Tallest Office, Northwest corner
32nd St. and Broadway, 105
West 125th St., New York, N.Y.
Brooklyn Office, 222 Washington
St., Brooklyn, for 30 days
following the printing of the
advertisement.

New York Woman Never Ceases to Be Young; She Fox-Trots at 60, Hair Not Even Gray!



No Shapeless Wrapper, Slippers and Rocking Chair
for Mme. Manhattan, If You Please, Not
If She Knows Herself.

Has Father Time Beaten to a Standstill, Complexion of Sweet Sixteen and Flirts With Her Granddaughter's Callers.

By Marguerite Mooers Marshall.

Question: At what age does a woman cease to be young?

Answer: Never—if she lives in New York.

The artist and I reached that cheering conclusion yesterday, after due investigation inspired by a despatch from Boston. In Boston, it seems, they consider thirty to be the fatal Rubicon between feminine youth and age. The Young Women's Christian Association is about to cast all women boarders over the age of onescore and ten, thus defining exactly the time when a woman ceases to be young—in Boston.

Those of us who are acquainted with the town know that, in more ways than one, Boston is an old ladies' home let loose on the landscape. The aged Boston female of thirty-one is simply a practical example of nature's law of adjustment to environment. On the other hand, if Ponce de Leon had arrived but a few hundred years later and miles further north, he would surely have found his Fountain of Youth on the Fifth Avenue of today.

Amusing, if you like, but also gallant, is the New York woman's refusal to acknowledge age. Not for her the shapeless wrapper and slippers, the rocking chair and bag of peppermints, the long afternoon nap. At sixty she dresses smartly and sits in a straight-backed chair by choice, while fox-trots and Suffrage clubs leave her no time for napping.

YOUTHFULNESS OF MILADI EMPHASIZED BY MODES.

The eternal youth of miladi on Fifth Avenue is emphasized this season by the extreme youthfulness of all the newest modes. When Dame Fashion decreed the high-school-girl skirt, the short, childish coat, the ruffled-tailored hat, did the New York grandmamma flinch? She did—not. At intervals we saw her on the Avenue, a tasseled tam or a Glengarry with pink velvet streamers perched on her dear old head, her skirts stopping an inch or two above the tops of her two-colored boots, and her cheeks as pinkly flushed as her granddaughter's.

Near the corner of Forty-second Street we found one woman with gray hair. In Boston she undoubtedly would have worn a black lace bonnet trimmed with two or three purple pansies and a "good" black silk dress made at least five years ago. When we saw her, however, she stepped briskly along in a street suit of blue and green plaid, boots of dark blue cloth and patent leather, and a hat wreathed with pink roses and pale blue velvet. She would never have admitted that she was old, and as a matter of fact, she didn't look it.

Did you never notice the astonishingly small number of females in New York who have gray hair? We noted not more than two or three in our pilgrimage down the Avenue and through various tea rooms. Even those women whose faces, after shrewd study, showed traces of advancing years, possessed blond or brown coiffures. Gray hair is decidedly "out!" On that note, at least, Mme. Manhattan has succeeded in checkmating Father Time.

HER COMPLEXION RIGHT, EVEN IF SHE BUYS IT.

In the matter of complexion it seems to me that she has been less successful. I confess to a preference

MANAGERS MAY NOT BAR CRITICS FROM THEATRES

Justice Hendrick So Decides in the Case of Alexander Woolcott, Refused Admission by the Shuberts.

Theatrical managers have no right to refuse admission to dramatic critics or to eject them from theatres, according to a decision handed down today by Supreme Court Justice Peter Henrictick in the case of Alexander Woolcott, critic for the Times, who sued out an injunction restraining the Shubert theatrical interests from interfering with his attendance upon their productions.

Judge Hendrick says:

"Carried into practice, that doctrine that no person has any right to enter a theatre unless it be with the consent of the manager or owner would justify any manager in refusing to admit to his theatre, and even after admission to eject or cause to be ejected any person or persons without cause or reason except the will of the manager or owner of the theatre. Under such a doctrine the victim of the manager's resentment may recover the money he has paid for the ticket and the disbursements made in connection with the ticket but must still suffer humiliation and inconvenience without recourse."

The Shuberts claimed that Woolcott's adverse criticisms had caused them considerable pecuniary loss and the only way they could prevent this was to eject him from their playhouses or refuse to sell him tickets.

CALL HER A BURGLAR.

Woman Arrested After Trying to Climb Through a Window.

Abram Davis, who owns a candy store at No. 382 Madison Street and sleeps in the rear, was awakened early this morning by the noise of a window being raised. Then he saw a queer form climbing through the window. He ran outside and thought it was a regular burglar and he was suddenly discovered it was a woman, very tall and very fat. She was panting painfully as she strove to get into the house. Mrs. Davis, who is called a policewoman, and the woman was arrested. As she was being led away, she was Diane Phillips, 40, a widow, No. 6 Matt Street, and that she was looking for the home of a friend. As she had two empty sandwiches with her she was charged with burglary.

POLES PUT FAITH IN WILSON.

Committee Representing 100,000
Hire Back His Policy.

The Mayor's Committee for Relief of sufferers by the Louisiana Disaster announced to-day that \$13,437 had been collected. The list of contributions given out this morning totals \$1,000.

The latest list of contributions follows:

Charles M. Higgins, \$10; Felix M. Warburg, \$100; W. J. Knott, \$10; Jenkins, Gwynne & Co., \$10; Selmar Hess, \$10; John Oscar Hirsch, \$10; William G. Wallace, \$10; Ruth A. Karpman, \$10; Mrs. Pierpoint Morgan, \$10; Martin Beckhard, \$20; M. DeWoritzky, \$10; M. C. Housler, \$25; W. Estington & Co., \$10; A. Friend, \$10; Lewis E. Clarke, \$10; Franklin Petrie, \$25; J. P. Grace, \$10; A. M. Lewis, \$10; Horace White, \$10.

Also she keeps her mind young; or what passes for her mind. In the one instance she reads Ellen Key; in the other, a best-seller. She goes to problem matinees, takes lessons in fox-trotting, flirts with the young men who call on her grandmother, and that young lady's sympathetic confidante. If body or brain fails she never admits it. No rest cure for a grandmamma!

Is it undignified, hysterical, this flouting of old age? Perhaps so. But though Robert Browning wrote:

"She will of her, such she has made,

"She will never, never get any woman to believe it. And in her instant clutch at youth the New York woman is simply showing the courage of her convictions."

MECHANIC'S DELIGHT

From the Buffalo News

Mrs. Highfield is aviation mad—

"I do not."

"Sure. She advertised for a gift to do plane cooking."

BARNES ON STAND ADMITS PLUCKING A PRINTING PLUM

Got Stock in Albany Concern for a Gift and Explains Why.

LOEB ENTERS DENIAL

Cross-Examination Is Finished and More Lawmakers Are Called to Testify.

SYRACUSE, N. Y., May 18.—William Barnes testified under cross-examination in the Supreme Court here to-day that in 1907 he was given ten shares of stock in the J. B. Lyon Company of Albany, after he had expressed a desire to become a partner of the founder of the printing concern so that he might properly be associated with public printing. Mr. Lyon, however, had given him nothing.

Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. No, of course not.

Q. Do you mean to say you went to see Mr. Lyon and told him you hoped Mr. McCarthy would not get the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr. McCarthy before you got the contract?

Q. Now there was nothing you had done to justify Mr. Lyon paying you wages?" A. I know.

Q. You know there were any differences between Mr. Lyon and Mr